

1                                   **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
2                                   **FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

3  
4           **FRANCISCO RIVERA-MUÑIZ, et al.,**

5                   **Plaintiffs,**

6                   **v.**

7           **HORIZON LINES INC., et al.,**

8                   **Defendants.**

**Civil No. 09-2081 (GAG)**

9  
10                                   **ORDER**

11           Plaintiffs, nine domiciliaries of Puerto Rico and their respective conjugal partnerships, bring  
12 this class action on behalf of themselves and similarly situated consumers in Puerto Rico against  
13 Defendants, Horizon Lines Inc.; Horizon Lines LLC; Horizon Logistics LLC; Horizon Lines of  
14 Puerto Rico Inc.; Sea Star Lines LLC; and Crowley Liner Services, Inc. (See Docket No. 62.)  
15 Among other offenses, Plaintiffs allege price-fixing and conspiracy to fix prices in violation of the  
16 Puerto Rico Antitrust Act (“PRAA”), P.R. Laws Ann. tit. 10, §§ 257–276 (2009).

17           On September 3, 2010, this court issued an Opinion and Order granting in part and denying  
18 in part Defendants’ motions for dismissal. (See Docket No. 109.) In that Opinion and Order, this  
19 court dismissed all claims except for Plaintiffs’ claim for price-fixing in violation of PRAA. (See  
20 id.) With respect to the remaining claim, this court certified the question of the extraterritorial reach  
21 of PRAA to the Puerto Rico Supreme Court. (See Docket No. 112.)

22           Defendants now move to certify an additional question to the Puerto Rico Supreme  
23 Court—whether indirect purchasers have standing to bring suit under PRAA. (See Docket No. 116.)  
24 Plaintiffs oppose this latest motion. (See Docket No. 117.)

25           As noted in the Opinion and Order, “[f]or cases in diversity, this court must defer to the  
26 decisions of the Puerto Rico Supreme Court on matters relating to Puerto Rico law.” (See Docket  
27 No. 109 at 5 n.3 (citing Rodríguez v. Suzuki Motor Corp., 570 F.3d 402, 406 (1st Cir. 2009)).) This  
28

1 **Civil No. 09-2081 (GAG)**

2

3 policy of federalism is embodied in the Rule of Decision Act, which commands federal courts to  
4 apply relevant state law in civil actions unless displaced by specific federal legislation on point. See  
5 28 U.S.C. § 1652. Even if this court disagrees with the reasoning of the Puerto Rico Supreme Court,  
6 this court cannot overrule the Commonwealth court on issues pertaining to local substantive law.  
7 See Suzuki Motor Corp., 570 F.3d at 406.

8 Certification of unsettled questions of Puerto Rico law to the Puerto Rico Supreme Court is  
9 a helpful aid in finding the correct substantive law for application and avoiding unnecessary rulings  
10 on such matters. See Romero v. Colegio de Abogados de P.R., 204 F.3d 291, 305-06 (1st Cir.  
11 2000). Because certification is premised upon deference to the Commonwealth's judicial autonomy,  
12 see id., it is not a vehicle to force the high court to revisit settled matters of Puerto Rico law.

13 The Puerto Rico legislature enacted PRAA in 1964. Pressure Vessels of P.R., Inc. v. Empire  
14 Gas de P.R., 137 P.R. Dec. 497, 519 (1994).<sup>1</sup> Since then, federal precedents have limited standing  
15 in private antitrust actions under federal law to direct purchasers. See Ill. Brick Co. v. Illinois, 431  
16 U.S. 720, 746 (1977). Without citing Illinois Brick explicitly, the Puerto Rico Supreme Court  
17 rejected such limitations on standing for the purpose of private antitrust actions under PRAA. See  
18 Pressure Vessels, 137 P.R. Dec. at 519 (citing federal precedents limiting antitrust standing that  
19 postdate enactment of PRAA in 1964). According to the Commonwealth court, the legislative intent  
20 under PRAA must be inferred from the state of federal case law in 1964—when federal precedents  
21 tended to favor liberal standing requirements in private antitrust actions. Id. Because the Puerto  
22 Rico Supreme Court has unequivocally rejected limitations to private antitrust standing under  
23 PRAA, this court must deny Defendants' motion for certification.<sup>2</sup> See Romero, 204 F.3d at 305-06.

24 In view of the foregoing, this court hereby **DENIES** Defendants' Joint Motion for  
25 Certification (Docket No. 116).

---

26 <sup>1</sup> For English translation, www.westlaw.com (Enter "1994 P.R.-Eng. 909,547" into search by citation).

27  
28 <sup>2</sup> If Defendants wish to amend the standing requirements under PRAA, they must appeal to the Puerto Rico legislature or present their arguments in a proper judicial venue in the Commonwealth.

**Civil No. 09-2081 (GAG)**

**3**

**SO ORDERED.**

In San Juan, Puerto Rico this 13<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2010.

*s/ Gustavo A. Gelpi*

GUSTAVO A. GELPI  
United States District Judge